

Application No. 09/991,280  
Amendment dated May 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 3, 2004 (Paper No. 15)

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 6-12, 15 and 16 are pending in the application. Claim 11 has been amended to define the location of the hose connector. Support for this amendment can be found in Figures 3-5 and 7, 9 and 11. Claim 15 has been amended to add features of an annular groove and a stopper. New claim 16 has been added. Support for the amendments to Claim 15 and for new Claim 16 can be found in Figures 3 and 6-8. As set forth more fully below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

#### **The Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Should Be Withdrawn**

##### **A. Rejection of Claim 15**

The Examiner has rejected Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Roos (U.S. Patent No. 3,677,578) in view of Neuschotz (U.S. Patent No. 3,212,796). Currently pending Claim 15, as amended, requires an annular groove formed on an outer surface of a pressed portion for receiving a portion of a coupled member and a stopper formed in the annular groove. The annular groove prevents the sealing member from being dropped. The stopper prevents the sealing member from being rotated with respect to the coupled member. None of the cited references disclose a sealing member including the annular groove and the stopper.

Figure 7 of Roos shows a bead (46) at the lower end of the sleeve (12). As described at Col. 3, line 61 to Col. 4, line 1, the bead (46) is formed by radial expansion of the sleeve (12) when the fitting (10) is completely inserted. No groove is formed on the outer surface of the sleeve (12). In addition, Roos does not disclose or suggest a stopper formed in a groove.

Neuschotz shows shows an element (12) having a groove for receiving a seal ring (30). However no stopper is formed in the groove. Therefore, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach every limitation of the pending claims, as amended, and respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

##### **B. Rejection of Claims 11 and 12**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious

Application No. 09/991,280

Amendment dated May 27, 2004

Reply to Office Action mailed March 3, 2004 (Paper No. 15)

over Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,886,019) in view of Schirado (U.S. Patent No. 5,348,048).

The flow control valve of Claim 11 requires a fitting portion with a male thread and a main body with a hose connector. As shown in Figures 3-5, 7, 9 and 11, the hose connector is arranged at the upper end of the control valve and the male thread is arranged at the lower end of the control valve. None of the cited references disclose a hose connector arranged at an opposite side with respect to a male thread, as claimed.

The Examiner states that Davis et al. does not disclose a hose connector and that Schirado discloses a hose connector. The Examiner acknowledges that a stem (18) of Davis et al, which engages with an opening (16) of an engine (10), serves as a fitting portion of the claimed invention. The stem (18) has a threaded portion (24) at the lower end and a baffle wall (34) at the upper end. As shown in Figure 4, the baffle wall (34) must be covered by a cup (20) to condense oil mist and to return condensed oil back to the engine (10). If Davis et al. and Schirado are combined, oil mist will be exhausted through a hose connector arranged at the top of the stem (18) and will not be condensed and returned back to the engine. Thus, a person skilled in the art would not combine Davis et al. and Schirado to arrange a hose connector at the upper end of the stem (18).

Additionally, Davis et al. relates to an oil-recovering engine breather, not to a control valve. Thus there is not motivation to combine Schirado with Davis et al. Therefore, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion or motivation in the references to make the combination and there is no reasonable expectation of success in combining the teachings of the two references. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for

Application No. 09/991,280

Amendment dated May 27, 2004

Reply to Office Action mailed March 3, 2004 (Paper No. 15)

allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: Robert D. Traver

Robert D. Traver

Registration No. 47,999

1560 Broadway, Suite 1200

Denver, Colorado 80202-5141

(303) 863-9700

Date: 27 MAY 2004